


AID & ABET

POLICE & MILITARY NEWSLETTER



Special Issue #18

Constitutional Issues for Lawmen & Soldiers

Spring 2006

"All human law which contradicts HIS laws we are conscience bound to disobey." - American Founder, George Mason

Published for members of Law Enforcement, Military, National, Air and Coast Guards. The General Public is welcome to subscribe. Publisher/ Executive Editor: Military Veteran and Peace Officer Jack McLamb, Ret., Idaho. Contributing Editor: Peace Officer A. Rick Dalton, Ret., Arizona. Writers: Sworn Peace Officers and Soldiers Worldwide. Marketing: Peter Giordano, Utah. National Headquarters: HC 11, Box 357, Kamiah, Idaho 83536 Phone: (208) 935-7852 FAX: (208) 935-7854 Web Site: www.police-and-military-against-the-new-world-order.org

THE FOUNDERS' PLAN for PREVENTING TYRANNY in GOVERNMENT - - - without bloodshed:



THE PEOPLE KNOWING
AND EXERCISING
THEIR RIGHTFUL
POWERS IN THE
COURTROOM

The Word of GOD says that it is *for* lack of knowledge His people perish. (*Hosea 4:6 and Isaiah 5:13*) And it is so true. We're losing our very nation and our freedoms because of the American People's lack of knowledge!

An American Peace Officer recently stated, "The People's rightful powers have been secretly usurped.... We are back under the King's court system again in America."

The picture on this cover tells an interesting story.... it seems Lady Justice is swiftly fleeing the court house. After reading this report there will be no question as to *why* She made her exit.

Learning and putting into practice what is in this police and military publication will enable Americans, peacefully and effectively, to take back our nation from tyrannical leadership in power today. Some of the absolute essentials for learning and living are:

- 1) Know that our Creator God is still on His Throne and expects His laws to be obeyed. This is number one!
- 2) Know the people's truly lawful, Constitutional powers and duties when serving on the People's Jury.
- 3) Know that county, state and federal judges are agents of government, first and foremost, and thus biased in that regard.
- 4) Know the ways in which U.S. judges **psychologically manipulate the minds of jurors**, unlawfully and secretly.
- 5) Know that in all 50 states, it is a felony to influence, threaten, or otherwise intimidate a juror or jury (with or without their knowledge) in an attempt to alter the outcome of a trial. (Yes, even when it is a government judge or prosecutor who commits the crime!) In your editor's own state criminal code, Jury Tampering is listed as a class 4 felony. Officer R. Stevens of New York state says "...not a day goes by that we (police officers) don't bear witness to the manipulation of juries and their decisions by dishonorable members of the judiciary."

JURY TAMPERING BY JUDGES

This is a topic for discussion AND COUNTERACTION long overdue by all concerned Americans, including those in law enforcement. The decision to devote this issue of *Aid & Abet* to this particular topic has been prompted by an ever-increasing number of questions, comments and reports surfacing of late, all of which point to this most glaring violation of constitutional protections by our nation's judiciary. (Note: Let us say to those readers more educated regarding "Article 3 Common Law Courts vs Admiralty Courts", that we have chosen, for simplicity, not to address that subject here, remembering that "one must always learn to walk first before attempting to run".)

A CRIMINAL ACT

It seems that many Officers of the Law strongly view a judge's secret, psychological control of the jury as a most serious crime against the sovereign American people. We say this because the kind of question most consistently asked by brother and sister lawmen across the U.S. is, "Why should we be required to arrest all those we see committing infractions such as misdemeanors, and yet be restrained from taking action against a judge who regularly commits felonies in our presence?" (Jury tampering = felony in most states.)

Personally, this editor is proud to know that so many of you lawmen agree that it is **past the time for speaking out** about this and other very important issues. Indeed, our oath of office does say, "I promise to protect the Constitution from all enemies both foreign and domestic", and the right to a "fair and impartial trial by a jury of our peers" is a most sacred part of that Constitution. In addition, you officers are re-affirming one of the oldest,

most essential pillars of our justice system, namely, that in America **NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW**. (or at least no one *should be* above the law.)

SILENCING POLICE OFFICERS

Fellow officers who have been with us for awhile have heard us caution before to **BE PREPARED** for the "discouragement campaign" that your Department may well begin to wage against you. One very effective tactic police superiors commonly use to dissuade and quell "forbidden" inquiries or discussions of "inside" criminal activity is to tell us that: **"As sworn officers of the law, you police are no longer citizens, but rather are an entity of government; you therefore have no constitutional protections regarding such things as the right to privacy or free speech."**

Be assured: This is a prevaricated lie perpetrated by some government officials to help keep law officers "in line", and prevent their protesting (or even discussing!) any inequities, dishonesties, or other forms of corruption they find within the governmental system.....and there is plenty of that, as you know. Under such a policy, peace officers will be far less likely to act as friends, sharing their true feelings, with those for whom they work - those whom they have sworn an oath to serve and protect - namely, the sovereign American people.

Somewhat surprisingly, the courts have held that officers *are indeed citizens*, with all the same unalienable rights as every other citizen. Just as we expect law-abiding private citizens to give honorable input, and exercise justice generally, concerning criminal activity they may witness, or other problems relating to any facet of government, I would ask this: *Who* is in a more perfect position than police officers to see what actually goes on inside the governmental system, *including* within our judiciary?

Because of the good lines of communication that our organization and *Aid & Abet Police and Military Newsletter* has with thousands of police officers across the U.S., we are kept abreast of the various methods being used to discourage police officers from involving themselves, and voicing the concerns they have, about serious problems in government. We heartily invite any of our readers with personal experiences or any information along these lines to please help keep your peers here at *Aid & Abet* informed, so that we, in turn, might inform others. (We also know of some very fine attorneys who love to be kept abreast of such violations of officers' rights.)

JUDGES AS GOVERNMENT AGENTS

Police officers who witness unlawful judicial activities in courtrooms today can attest to the fact that a judge can covertly, *at will*, decide the outcome of any jury trial that comes before him or her, and often does do, particularly when the special interests of his political overlords and benefactors are at stake.

Many police officers understand as fact that - - unspoken and unholy as it might be - - generally speaking, "his or her honor's" first duty, as a government agent and purely political appointee, is to protect the interests of those who *really* control government today (and that is *not* the common people). First and foremost, the judge is there to uphold and enforce the philosophies and political agendas of very powerful forces ruling from behind the

scenes. All the while, an unwitting, misled and disenfranchised Public is fed the lie that "judges are there to protect the citizen's right to a fair trial". Really, now! It hasn't been that way for a very long time.

We lawmen know that a great many judges are among the most corrupt people in society. By and large, judges are appointed only after having been monitored for years as "low life" attorneys, to assure that they can be truly trusted to loyally protect and serve our nation's highest, most powerful, treasonous leaders and their rarely seen globalist overlords. Once a candidate for judgeship has been shown to have the same moral code as his or her superiors, such a one is chosen for higher appointments, to further protect the status quo. That's what we law officers know to be true concerning the vast majority of our nation's lawyer/judges.....and we personally know it well.

IS THERE MAGIC IN THAT BLACK DRESS?



People should remember that in almost every poll taken concerning which group of their fellow citizens the American people believe to be the most dishonorable and untrustworthy members of society, *lawyers* are

most often voted number one. So let's think about this for a moment. What is there about putting a black dress on a dishonest, scoundrel lawyer, and changing the title to "judge", that would suddenly, magically transform such a one into a person of honor? How so easily transform a villain into a saint? The truth is, there is no magic and no transformation. If a lawyer lives and operates as "the scum of the earth", then "lawyer-turned-judge" will be no different. Only the outer garb has changed, and incidentally, within the "dark side" of the occult, **BLACK** is always appropriate!

In the Holy Bible we read "Woe to you lawyers! For you load men with burdens hard to bear, and you yourselves do not touch the burdens with one of your fingers." - *Luke 46:11* And "Woe to you lawyers! For you have taken away the key of knowledge. You did not enter in yourselves, and those who were entering in, you hindered." - *Luke 52:11* [Editor's note: And these despicable individuals we allow to rule over us, as virtual demi-gods in the people's courts!]

POLICE OFFICER WITNESSES

As police officers have witnessed for decades criminal behavior in the courts on the part of government agent judges and prosecutors, some years ago one concerned and rather outspoken officer put it this way:

"UNDER PRESENT JUDICIAL RULES AND CUSTOMS, THE SOCIAL OR POLITICAL AIMS OF ANY PARTICULAR SITTING JUDGE (OR THOSE OF HIS SUPERIORS), CAN OVERPOWER, AT THE JUDGE'S DISCRETION, THE FREE WILL OF ANY JURY. ILLICIT IN NATURE, THIS CRIMINAL USURPATION OF POWER - - THE ACTUAL

CONTROL SEQUENCE - - IS ACCOMPLISHED NEARLY ALWAYS WITHOUT THE JURY BEING AWARE OF ITS APPLICATION." ~ Peace Officer Jack McLamb, June 1985, Phoenix, Arizona.

Although there be few in power brave enough to label it so, these are *high crimes*: violations of the very foundation of constitutional mandates covering the American jury system. The Public is never to know this because it is believed that the people would not tolerate such criminally subversive activities.

In a July 1989 letter, a then 14-year veteran police officer shared with our association his own, and others' concerns as follows:

"Some of us (police officers) have quietly discussed this activity on several occasions, but must confess that we have never understood why a judge is allowed to jury tamper. For example, in special cases that come before them, they regularly withhold crucial evidence from the jury, deny important testimony of witnesses in a case, and employ other underhanded, concealed tactics which of course directly affect the outcome of the jury decision.

Our main question should be, 'Why is this not considered a crime for a judge, when it is considered so for all other people?' Also, if it is a crime, *to whom would we go* in reporting a judge's unlawful activities?.....to another corrupt judge engaged in the very same activity? They all do it!

It is a unanimous consensus here that, regardless of how right and *legal* our protests might be, *the officers involved* in bringing public attention to such powerful, clandestine, political controls and crimes perpetrated by judges, would probably be the only ones punished. What we need is mass support from the public in order to effect the necessary changes." ~ Sgt. M. T. of Texas

It is not difficult to relate to the frustrations of this officer as he and others at his Department struggle to resolve this dilemma. It is hard to witness such systemic illegal activity *regularly*, and endure the sense of helplessness that goes with it. Since most people seems so unaware that these crimes are occurring in our courts, there is probably not the public support needed to be able to bring corrective enforcement action. Sgt. M.T. had it *absolutely right*: Can't we just see a police chief, one of the politically-appointed "yes men" standing up and taking on this one?! Some of our good 'ole Sheriffs - *elected by and politically accountable to the People* - just *might* take such a stand, but very few of today's government-appointed Police Chiefs would.

THE PUBLIC MUST COME TO KNOW THE FACTS

Sgt. M.T. of Texas has the best answer: **MASSIVE PUBLIC PRESSURE** is the means by which we will purge our judicial system of anyone currently within it who dares to usurp and vitiate the sacred judicial powers of the American people. Toward that end, we concerned lawmen **must commit ourselves** first of all, to learn and understand fully the issues involved. Next, do all we can to alert more of our fellow officers to the *seriousness* of the currently rampant criminal activity in our courts. Thirdly, we will need to help inform all other citizens as rapidly as possible. Ultimately, this gigantic task will best be accomplished by us police officers banding together and

then **networking with those in the private sector** who share our concerns. As a help toward that end, this particular issue of *Aid & Abet News* will need to be distributed amongst our colleagues, and shared especially with all private citizens who may be called to serve on a jury.

"The law is perverted and the police powers of the state perverted along with it! The law not only turns from its proper purpose, but was made to follow a totally contrary purpose. The law becomes a weapon of every kind of greed. Instead of checking crime, the law itself becomes crime, and guilty of the evils it is supposed to pursue."

- Great legal scholar and patriot, Frederick Bastiat, 1884

[Editor's note: This great man, Bastiat, must have had a crystal ball.....to be able to know the exact system we would be under in the 21st. century.]

SO, WHAT'S THIS "JUDGES' CRIMINAL CONDUCT" ALL ABOUT?

Logically, before one can evaluate **WHAT IS WRONG**, he must first know **WHAT IS RIGHT**.

For those of us who may have forgotten some of what we learned in "Government 101" (and which today is purposely not taught in government "schools") regarding how the American judicial system is supposed to work, let us review briefly the constitutional system we were given, and then note how that system has been surreptitiously uprooted - and replaced - by the corrupt and fraudulent one currently operating in our courts.

The American system of justice was built upon some very sound, basic principles, the most important of which is that **THE PEOPLE** are the rightful kings and queens (the sovereigns) of the nation. In our Constitutional Republic, far from being our *rulers*, government - - including its agents in black dresses - - is but a conglomeration of *hired public servants* of a sovereign people.....and they all need to be made aware of that!

By way of further explanation.....

1) The sixth and seventh Amendments in our *Bill of Rights* guarantee to each citizen a right of trial by a jury of his or her own peers, as was clearly understood, and so stated, by our Founders.

2) The sovereigns serving on the People's jury are to **judge the law as well as the facts** in all cases brought before them.

3) The Jury is to hear **all** witnesses and examine **all** evidence pertinent to a case. How else can a just verdict be rendered?

4) The judge's rightful function is that of *impartial moderator* of trial proceedings, sometimes serving also as an *unbiased referee* on points of contention between prosecutor and defense counsel. The judge may serve also as a legal resource for the jury, answering particular inquiries, etc.

5) *Finally, it is the sovereign People's Jury* alone which determines the fact (i.e. guilt or innocence) and then sets the penalty for a guilty party.

Although there are more, these five basic parameters are viewed as *vital* for a fair and just system of dispensing justice. *If these basics were once again enforced, they*

would effectively eliminate the possibility of despotic rulers ever again gaining dictatorial control over America, imprisoning anyone they wish, as we are witnessing today.

Our Founders and forefathers knew the importance of maintaining these controls on government. They had just come out from under a system in which the king, through his agent/judges, would hold phony show trials, then simply eliminate dissenters *at will*. It was therefore no accident that our Founders built *safeguards* into our system of government (such as in the form of the People's Jury) in hopes of preventing such tyranny from ever occurring in the new land. But today we seem to have forgotten the past, and so are suffering many of the same tyrannies anew.

THE KING'S MEN ARE BACK

In the main, today's American public still believes, however naively, that these Constitutional safeguards are still in place and presently functioning. Most people do not know what all judges, attorneys and *some* local police officers do know, namely, that very gradually, behind their backs, both their lawful power as jurors as well as their constitutionally-guaranteed right to a fair trial by a jury of their peers, have been secretly removed. As those "in the know" clearly understand, "the king's men" are once again back in control of "the king's" courts. And currently, as some like to joke, it's not despotic King George the 3rd, but rather despotic "King George the Bush" now on the throne. Of course, as the U.S. president is only a puppet for the super-rich criminal elite of today, it could just as well be King Al Gore or Queen Hillary Clinton; **it would make no difference**. Regardless of whatever puppet the overlord puppeteers put in place at any one time, their plan to impose totalitarian powers over the American people remains unchanged. This is why administrations change, but policies and implementations do not. But, that is another story for another day.

SECRET COURT SYSTEM OF THE PUPPET MASTERS



Let's now contrast the 5 basic, judicial parameters identified above - - which for some decades did indeed guarantee a just and honest judicial system for Americans

-- with the way the injustice system of today secretly works. Under the rules which the present *international criminal aristocracy* has set up for itself, not only are government agent/judges politically appointed, but are given absolute judicial immunity from prosecution, should they be caught lying, cheating or engaging in any of the other criminal acts listed herein.

Under this set-up, private political dynasties of today (under the umbrella of this international criminal elite) are protected and preserved, not to mention given the security

of personal wealth and power. We list and discuss here a number of the major changes that have been implemented, as part of a massive judicial overhaul which has allowed these elitists to control the outcome of any American jury trial they wish.

They accomplish their goals by:

1) APPOINTING ONLY THEIR OWN SOLD-OUT, BOUGHT-AND-PAID-FOR LAWYERS TO JUDGESHIP IN AMERICA.

There are many competent and HONEST private citizens who could serve well as judges at all levels. However, the international criminal elite can't trust the common people to obey their despotic orders.

2) DENYING A DEFENDANT THE RIGHT TO A TRIAL BY A JURY OF HIS PEERS. Relative to this particular treachery, lawyers and judges today routinely engage a rather involved process that goes by the sophisticated term, "VOIR DIRE". It is an exercise by which, through questioning of prospective jurors (and process of elimination) both prosecutor and defense counsel will attempt to tailor the jury pool in a way to best facilitate each side's desired outcome.

But, here's what we need to know to oppose this unconstitutional farce: Constitutionally, members of the jury are always to be the *neighbors and peers* of the accused....just as the Bill of Rights says: "jury of their peers" selected from the common community wherein the defendant allegedly committed the crime(s). But those wielding the power today like to "stack" juries as they would try to do in cases like the following: Suppose a defendant is facing trial for allegedly having stolen welfare checks from retirees. In their quest for conviction, should government prosecutors, using today's "voir dire" jury selection system, be allowed to place purposely on that jury a number of welfare recipients, or social security retirees? Of course not, we say. But yet, that is routinely done. Suppose another defendant is charged with non-payment of taxes. Would it be correct or fair for prosecutors to try to fill that jury with government employees or people who are living off the public dole? But again, common practice today.

How's this for some "unbelievable"? In the Tom Metzger case, the prosecution secretly hired some 25 attorneys and psychologists to conduct deep-cover investigations of *every prospective juror*, digging into every aspect of each one's personal history. Imagine yourself being summoned by government to appear for jury duty, only to find out later that an undercover team conducted a secret investigation on you, all because you might possibly become a juror! Compare such travesty with the honest simplicity of jury selection under the principles of Common Law. Under that system, a jury of our peers is chosen **totally at random**. Court officials of the locale wherein an alleged crime was committed would refer to listings of competent citizens living within that immediate area. (In the present-day system these could be property owners, registered voters, licensed "drivers", etc.) At any rate, *random selection* is nothing more complicated than placing all eligible names "in a big hat", shaking them up a bit, and the first 12 names drawn out make up the jury. Now, *that's random!* Straightforward and simple, with absolutely no interrogation from either side, and

almost no chance for anyone to stack the jury. In other words, NO "VOIR DIRE". There can be no fairer system to guarantee that a defendant receives the true justice everyone deserves. Only with random selection will we ever again have an **unbiased jury of peers**. Self-serving (vested interest) judges and lawyers must be removed from the process.

3) SELECTIVELY WITHHOLDING EVIDENCE AND TESTIMONY FROM THE JURY.

This is perhaps the most powerfully damaging way in which a government agent judge and prosecutor can conspire to psychologically bend the minds of jurors to deliver an outcome the government wants. Under this unbelievable practice, jurors are allowed to see only that evidence, and consider the testimony of only those witnesses *arbitrarily approved* by the court. Everything and everyone else is summarily excluded. Even when additional, seemingly viable evidence comes to the attention of the jury, as often happens in the course of trial, the judge can simply "rule to strike" if he so chooses, strictly charging the jury to disregard such witnesses or evidence.

As unspeakable as it seems, this is now commonly accepted practice in courtrooms nationwide. Of all the corrupt practices one may witness in these courts, perhaps none top this, and words fail in trying to describe the demonic insanity of it all. When held hostage (in mind and conscience) in this way, prevented from *weighing all the facts and evidence pertaining to a case*, how can a jury ever render a sound and just verdict? The answer is, very often they cannot!

This is how the government railroaded our dear brother, top FBI agent, Col. Richard Taus, into prison over 15 years ago, for a crime which hard evidence PROVED he could not have committed. This evidence showed that at the time certain alleged victims claimed Richard was in a particular place committing a personal assault crime, he actually was out of town.....way out of town, in fact.....on weekend Army Reserve training. However, a corrupt, sold-out, government agent judge would not allow the jury to see the evidence that would have cleared him of the crime, 100 % . Some of our readers will remember how [earlier] FBI agent Taus had obtained evidence, with witnesses, to prove CIA and Mob involvement in bringing tons of illegal drugs into the U.S. for distribution on the streets of America. Yet at his trial, the judge would not allow Richard to call to the stand two such (government) witnesses who were prepared to tell the jury about how high-level superiors at the FBI had instructed Richard not only to drop his CIA/Mob illegal drug investigation, but ordered him to go out and "terminate" those same government witnesses - which, of course, Richard refused to do.

Shouldn't we think that *not being at the scene of an alleged crime* should be "hard evidence" enough for any jury to vote a defendant NOT GUILTY??? Certainly yes, but *only if* the jury is left free to hear, see and weigh all. Our honorable brother would not then have been imprisoned, where he remains still, locked away from his young son and mother for the last 15 years. But, a case like this serves to illustrate exactly why so many government agent judges and prosecutors "need" the power to control what evidence jurors see and hear, and

then apply when deliberating their verdict. As a partial solution to this problem, any juror who finds out that a judge and prosecutor have withheld evidence and witnesses from the jury's consideration should always vote to acquit the victimized defendant! Often, however, jurors are prevented from even knowing that they've not been given all the evidence in the case.....which pinpoints the horror of the very point we are making. Anyone wishing to be of support to Richard, and perhaps extend a note of caring for the well-being of his family as well, may write Richard Taus #91 A 1040 LH 420, Clinton Correctional Facility, P.O. Box 2001, Dannemora, N.Y. 12929.

Sad as it is, we know that the story of Richard Taus is far from unique. We could go on filling many more pages, telling of other, equally-tragic cases, including those of Congressmen George Hansen and James Traficant - - neither one guilty of criminal acts - - yet both rail-roaded into prison none-the-less, by a government which hated their honest service to the American people. (A year or two ago Aid & Abet did devote an entire issue reporting on many of these sad cases. If interested in a copy, write us, requesting Special #16.) The court records of America are laden with evidence of countless capital crimes - including numerous murders - committed against our fellow Americans on the orders of higher-ups in government. Such evidence, although certainly there, is largely secreted away, "safely" buried (at least for now) under the weighty and heavily-guarded shroud of government's tyrannical controls. But, *as God lives*, we have hope, knowing that this will not always be.

4) HIDING FROM THE JURY THEIR LAWFUL RIGHT AND DUTY TO JUDGE BOTH THE FACTS OF A CASE AND THE JUSTICE OF THE LAW BEING APPLIED.

Any trial judge who tells prospective jurors the following: 1) they (jurors) are to judge *only the facts of the case* (i.e., determine whether or not the defendant did the crime), 2) that it is the judge's job alone to explain the law to them, and 3) that they are required to apply the law to the case only as the judge instructs them, *is engaging in a lie*.

By means of that untrue and unlawful directive, the government agent judge has just misled those prospective jurors, and appropriated unto himself or herself an awesome, secret power to potentially influence the outcome of the trial. The truth is that, to fully do his or her job when serving on any case, a juror must judge whether the law itself is, a) fair, b) constitutional, and c) morally right as applied to the accused. This is fact according to the Supreme Laws of our Land, and has been verified by numerous, official statements of many higher court judges of the past. Fully-informed jurors must be prepared to know and do this on their own, because most of today's politically-appointed, bought-and-paid-for judges will explain none of it. In most cases, he or she is there as an agent of government, enforcing a system, and not necessarily to see that the accused gets a fair trial.

A government agent judge will not care, for example, that the Supreme Court rightly decided in *Marbury vs Madison*, 5 US (2 Cranch) 137, 174, 176 that: "All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void." Further, although aware of them, the government agent judge will ignore even his own rules, such as under

16 Am. Jur 2d, Sec 177 late 2nd, Sec 256 which says, "An unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void." and continues: "No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law, and no courts are bound to enforce it."

Going back to some of the very early days of our Republic, we find these honest testaments:

"The jury has a right to judge both the law as well as the fact in controversy." - John Jay, 1st Chief Justice, U.S. Supreme Court, 1789

"The jury has the right to determine both the law and the facts." - Samuel Chase, U.S. Supreme Court Justice, 1796

"The jury has the power to bring a verdict in the teeth of both law and fact." - Oliver Wendell Holmes, U.S. Supreme Court Justice, 1902

PEOPLE'S JURY VERY SCARY TO DESPOTS!

With cites like those on the books....just waiting to be more widely discovered - - and there certainly are plenty more - - we can easily see why criminal judicial rulers would not want (in fact are deathly afraid of) a truly educated citizen jury. If the truth be known, the *very existence* of a People's Jury is enough to "scare the pants off" tyrannical rulers who can tolerate no opposition. Their "enemies" they readily punish with threats, fines, and imprisonment, but their associates of like criminal mind (when caught) they treat ever-so-lightly, releasing and exonerating whenever possible through their agent judges and their secret manipulation and dictatorial control of jurors.

Nevertheless, truth and fact and right remain. If only enough private citizen jurors can come to know the full range of their power, and exercise it fearlessly and impartially at every opportunity, judicial tyrannies which now virtually "rule the day" can largely be brought to an end. An informed juror, owing his or her position to no one but Almighty God, can and must scrutinize both **the law and the facts of the case**, then *act upon* the total freedom he or she possesses to decide the matter accordingly - correctly and righteously. Broader and broader utilization of this kind of sovereign people power will demonstrate ever more loudly and decisively that the super-rich, international elitists who have long controlled (from behind the scenes) all the paid, politically-chosen lawyer lackeys in the U.S. Supreme Court, the Congress, whichever Republican Socialist or Democratic Socialist happens to be occupying the White House, and all 50 globalist governors across America **DO NOT HAVE THE POWER** to control the good, COMMON PEOPLE who still occupy this once Godly nation. In short, **TRAITORS AND DESPOTS CAN'T CONTROL STRONG, KNOWLEDGEABLE JURORS!**

HOW SHOULD A PROSPECTIVE JUROR RESPOND WHEN LIED TO BY A GOVERNMENT AGENT JUDGE?

It is sad commentary on the state of our present-day

American Republic when a well informed good American answers a call for jury duty, and, wishing to help see that justice is done, takes advantage of his or her right to serve in this way, knows before hand, that *in order to actually get to serve on that jury* there is a good chance he or she may be forced to engage in a certain amount of deception toward the judge and perhaps other court officials. Because we have a tyrannical power system in place today, it serves the particular interests of corrupt judges and prosecutors to see that jurors who do *not* know their full rights and powers are chosen to serve, and that those prospective jurors who *do* fully understand their powers and duties never make it onto a jury panel where they can *exercise* their lawful powers. Accordingly, the government agent judge, to weed out the informed, administers an oath, and issues to the prospective jurors instructions that are, in part, both unlawful and untrue, trusting that, unlike himself or herself, those good people probably will not lie, but will follow exactly what the agent judge tells them.

So it is that, in order to have the chance to serve true justice (perhaps protecting, through one's vote for acquittal, a defendant falsely and wrongly accused) an honorable and fully informed, prospective juror may need to keep private and secret his or her intent to *do right* in the jury room, even should that mean ignoring and/or going contrary to a dishonorable, corrupt judge's unlawful and/or misleading directives.

Throughout our national history good leaders have warned Americans about this. From the year 1788, *2nd. Elliotts Debates* explains: "If a citizen juror accepts as the law that which the judge states, then that juror has accepted the exercise of absolute authority of a government employee, and has surrendered a power and right that once was the citizen's safeguard of liberty." The truth cannot be stated more clearly than that!

BUT, IS IT RIGHT FOR A PROSPECTIVE JUROR TO DECEIVE (A DECEIVER)?

We officers of the law would never tell anyone to lie. We only mean to re-affirm that the objective of *any person of honor* is always to serve true justice. Obviously, in every courtroom experience, circumstances will vary. We can only counsel every prospective juror to first **pray** over each situation, asking for guidance to know what is the best response to make. We also can point you to the Holy Word of God (preferably older versions such as the King James, as some of the later translations have been significantly changed). But, there in the Bible one can actually find counseling on the subject of "blessed liars" - stories of persons who were blessed for misleading unrighteous government authorities; and disobeying the "lawful" governments of their day....*for reasons we know to have been righteous*, and that is always the key. For two examples of this, we can go to the *Old Testament (Exodus Ch. 1)* and read about the Hebrew midwives who were blessed for doing what they had to do to save Hebrew babies from murderous government authorities. Then there is the story of Rahab the Harlot (*Joshua, Ch.2*) who lied and mis-directed the lawful, government officials who came to her home searching for persons suspected of being spies. Please read of these instances where our Holy Creator God blessed liars, as they have much to say about

"lawful" but, evil government leaders today.

As much more recent examples, we can all recall how during Stalin's purges in Russia (which murdered 66 million Christians and others) many good citizens lied to the "lawful" authorities of the day to save others....or, how the good people of Germany took in families of Jews and hid them in their attics for safety.....at a time when this was against the law in their nation. Can anyone think that those courageous acts were anything but righteous? Can anyone fault these good citizens for out-and-out lying to the Nazi SS officials who came to the door asking, "Are there any Jews in your house?" Would any one of us in such a situation say, "I can't tell a lie to my lawful government, so, YES!... there are Jews in our attic!" We think not! So also, in our present day, we know that there are times when God expects us to take a righteous stand, and refuse to be a part of the wrongful acts of evil men, even those in trusted high places. *Acts 5:29* in the *New Testament* expresses well the overall principle exemplified in each such case: ***We ought to obey GOD rather than men!***

Indeed, sometimes, evil that even us tough cops are powerless to stop, one good, informed, civic-minded juror can!

5) THREATENING "CONTEMPT OF COURT" CHARGES AGAINST ANYONE CHALLENGING COURT AUTHORITY

All American defense attorneys are aware of the kinds of covert, as well as the more openly coercive and intimidating tactics of jury tampering engaged in regularly by judges and prosecutors, but almost none is willing to take the personal risk of being disbarred and even going to jail as a result of trying, on behalf of a client, to expose such criminal practices. One more reason why it falls to the INFORMED JUROR to *circumvent* such criminal government activity.

6) OVERRULING THE OBJECTIONS OF THE DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY WHILE SUSTAINING THOSE OF HIS PROSECUTOR TEAMMATE

This is a very powerful part of an underhanded, criminal scam against the defendant, and like most any unlawful tactics discussed thus far, is sufficiently damaging, in and of itself, to seriously shift the outcome of the trial in favor of the government prosecution.

This part of the conspiracy works like this: The government judge tries to prevent the defendant's attorney from telling the jury any of the facts that will help the defendant. Each time the defense attorney tries, the conspiratorial prosecutor will cry, "Objection, your honor!" - which objection the judge will most often sustain. Thus, whatever the defense attorney was going to tell or show the jury, he now cannot share. And any (possibly very important) information the jury *may have heard* is disallowed, and may not be considered as evidence in their deliberations. On the other hand, objections voiced by the defense attorney the judge will most often overrule, permitting the jury to receive that information and probably treat it as fact. This tactic regularly plays a very large part in unlawfully tailoring just what information does go to the jury, and therefore what they do and do not have to work with in preparing to render a verdict. In these kinds of "worst case scenarios"

the prosecutor, under the judge's protection, is free to tell or show the jury anything he wants to. This unfairly shapes the outcome of the trial.

7) BIASING THE JURY THROUGH EMOTION AND EXPRESSED OPINION

Proper judicial conduct at trial requires a judge to be impartial - that he or she keep personal feelings and judgments private, so as not to influence or prejudice the jury, either negatively or positively. A judge favoring conviction, for example, can very easily lower, in the eyes of the jury, the credibility of (one or both) defense counsel and defendant by the use of certain negative forms of voice and body language, making snide or impatient remarks, giving demeaning looks or bored expressions, etc., and just as easily by showing preferential treatment to the side the agent judge favors.



JUDGE'S Demeanor LOOK!

This has happened so often, especially in political trials, wherein a prejudiced judge will let the jury see his contempt for the defendant, the principles being espoused or the arguments set forth.

[Note: By a "political"

trial is meant one involving a defendant tried merely for having run afoul of a despotic system - often having challenged the ruling elite's power or programs. Most often in such trials, there is no injured party, and no law was broken - save perhaps a dictatorial one by which our controlling, international crime families demand from a sovereign people submission and obedience to their rule.]

But in continuing, let's remember that this is all just "law school 101". When a judge lets the jury see his or her bias, it is *not accidental*. This judge was likely a dishonorable attorney before growing up to be a judge, and knows exactly what he or she is doing. A juror who sees a judge behaving in this way can be sure that he or she is mentally (psychologically) manipulating the jury against the defendant. Some of our Founding Fathers wrote about this form of unlawful jury tampering by judges in their *Federalist Papers*. Number 65 on page 399 states simply: "**Juries are influenced by opinions of judges.**"

Keep always in mind: The job of a trial judge is that of an unbiased, impartial referee, and he or she *must not be allowed* to stray beyond that role. And again, if the judge has shown bias, the juror should vote to acquit the defendant!

8) CHANGING THE VENUE (OR LOCATION) OF TRIAL

Article 6 of the *Bill of Rights* clearly stipulates that an accused shall be tried "in the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed". **This is still the law**, no matter how many "logical" reasons modern day officials may think up for changing the location of any trial.

The defendant and the victim and the community (victim #2) all deserve to have the case tried locally, both for their convenient attendance, as well as those local

citizens being chosen to serve on the jury. It is the only fair way. In the case of political trials particularly, court officials often will decide to convene trial in some far-off part of the country where (if the defendant is someone they wish to see put away) the corrupt government leaders feel they will have a better chance of getting a conviction - aided perhaps by the fact that the greater distance prevents the attendance of larger numbers of supportive family, friends and fellow citizens from their town, and makes for lessened public scrutiny generally. On the other hand, if the defendant is a friend, business associate or *anyone* the top officials wish to see "get off", this change of venue may make it easier to accomplish that, as well.

So jurors, when you are asked to serve on a case which has been moved outside the defendant's community and the site of the crime, recognize this as an unlawful political move, either for or against the defendant. Seldom is a change of venue *not* an underhanded, criminal act on behalf of today's unethical, international rich elites in control of our political and judicial systems.

9) ISSUING INSTRUCTIONS DESIGNED TO UNDULY INFLUENCE THE JURY

In a judicial system more intent on upholding, preserving and reinforcing a political power structure than administering true justice, instructions issued by the presiding government trial judge can often be more for manipulative control purposes than for assuring the fair and lawful treatment of all concerned with the case. The subject of "judge's instructions" was touched upon briefly in #4 above, but we will reiterate, and say a little more about it here.

If, throughout the trial, government prosecutors have fairly-well badgered a defendant in front of the jury by means of some of the devious, criminal tactics already discussed here, this present one (judge's instructions to the jury) is often used as an attempt to "finish him off"! In political trials especially, where the judge is biased against the defendant, this, now, is where the judge can best exert his influence to help assure that the jury is psychologically manipulated, and will return the kind of verdict the government wants.

He or she begins by repeating the standard government lie that the jury is not to try to judge whether the law applied to the case is a good one or not, or even whether it properly does apply to the case at hand. "You the jury", he or she goes on to say, "are to apply the law to this case exactly as it has been explained to you - even if you think it is a dumb or stupid law, or if you think it is not the law at all." [Does this sound unbelievable to anyone?! Go to court and give a listen sometime. You're apt to hear these lies and more!]

Once again, the truth is that the jurors **always** have the right - and **indeed it is their DUTY** - to decide not only the facts of the case but also the justice (i.e. *correctness*) and *applicability* of the law which allegedly was broken in the case. Consider some case examples from our past: Should escaping slaves be returned to their "owners" just because there is a "law" (the Fugitive Slave Act) which says they must be returned? As you may remember, the people's jury, back in the 1850's, overturned this bad law by voting to acquit. Fairly and justly, the accused slaves' peers - the jurors who served on those cases - did not go along with the government agent

judge. Instead they courageously put the law itself on trial, *and found it wanting*, when weighed against the Law of true justice. The slaves, thereupon, were set free....even though "the law" on the books stated they were guilty. (Were not our Founders very wise men to place the courts in the hands of citizen jurors?)

The jury has always been a powerful force for justice and against tyranny in this land.....and it still is, but only if the serving members are kept aware of their full range of duties and powers, and allowed to use them, as apparently jurors in the nineteenth century were.

But again, a government bent on tyrannywhich more than we like to admit describes present-day America..... cannot allow "lowly serfs" (like a People's Jury!) to make such important political decisions. This is why we find so often that in trials today, at the point where final "jury instructions" are given, a government agent judge will see that the jury is provided all information possible that is favorable to the side of prosecution, and disallow and withhold, as much as possible, information that would favor or possibly even exonerate the defendant. Toward his desired end, the judge will strategically plant the prosecution's totally-biased "coup de grace" information into the minds of the jurors **just before they retire to begin deliberation**. But unless jurors are purposely educated as to such practices, and made aware ahead of time, the very "smoothness" of the whole operation may prevent them from even realizing that the judge and prosecution have been criminally conspiring against the defendant.

10) BRINGING THE WRONG CHARGE

This tactic is often used in cases involving various types of high profile personages such as political figures, corporate/financial moguls, etc., who in one way or another have associations or connections with the power elite. Once it "unfortunately!" becomes publicly reported that such a one is alleged to have committed a criminal act, a charge of some kind must be brought - if only as "eyewash" for the American public. It must be made to look like the offender is being "brought to justice". In such cases, however, the "justice done" will often be only a *charade* - a way of making the public (and a jury) *think* the government is doing what is right by "going after" a guilty colleague (whoever it might be).

Now comes the legal trick: Government "prosecutors" will purposely file a *wrong level* criminal charge against the accused. An example would be, filing a *1st degree* murder charge (when the prosecution knows it does not have the evidence to prove it) instead of a *correct* charge of manslaughter, for which there truly *is* sufficient evidence. In using this tactic, the government knows that, lacking the necessary evidence to prove the heavier charge, the jury will have no option but to let a defendant (friend or associate of the power elite) OFF. Of course, if the government had brought the proper charge of manslaughter, the jury could easily have found the defendant guilty. Now however, government prosecutors - knowing from the beginning that they could not prove the case on the wrong higher charge - can yet say in the end, as the defendant walks free, "Well, *we* did *our* job (by bringing the suspect to court to answer for his crimes) but that "bad" jury just let him off. Sorry, there was nothing more the government could do!" ("Bad, Bad Jury!")

11) ISSUING SUMMARY JUDGMENTS

All too often, a court's issuance of "summary judgment" on a case equates to *monumental fraud* perpetrated against unwitting, good citizens. As such, the practice is totally unconstitutional and criminal, and works like this: Concerning a particular case, a government agent judge is advised ahead of time as to who is to win and who is to lose! Then, without granting the defendant his or her *day in court* (as the U.S. *Bill of Rights, Article 6* says the government **MUST**) the compliant judge merely looks at the evidence and issues a ruling as to winner and loser. **NO DAY IN COURT!** Such horrendous injustice is very common today, occurring frequently in cases involving a *politically incorrect* citizen, whose property an agency of government (or *forces masquerading* as government) wishes to steal. (Does IRS come to mind?) Before the case is ever brought to court - much less heard by a jury! - the government agent judge will have received ("from on high") his or her marching orders.....and so, after possibly studying the evidence and possibly not, finds **FOR** the party predetermined to win. (Guess which one *that* usually is!)

Now, if the defendant happens to be an "insider" friend of the criminal government agents, or possibly even one of their handlers, he will prevail. Otherwise, the government agent judge just hands the defrauded victim/defendant's property over to the extortioners.....all based purportedly upon the judge's own discretion and determination of what the "evidence shows". (Baloney!!) Truth be told, it was based on what the judge was *told* to decide by his superiors or by the international elite overlords. Needless to say, all this equates to "an end run" around the rights of the people, bypassing entirely the people's right to *their day in court before a sovereign people's jury*. That very system government agent judges and their ruling higher-ups have conspired to dismantle and replace, knowing that a case allowed to go before an honest people's jury just might be decided fairly, and thus no longer within the government's power to manipulate.

12) PRESSURING JURORS TO CHANGE VOTE

Sometimes a government agent judge will become very upset, even angry, if a jury does not go along with his or her wishes regarding their verdict in a case. Likewise, if one or more jurors hold out against the decision of the others. It happens often that judges have brought jurors back into court to admonish, scare or threaten them, sending them back to the jury room with orders not to come out until they have reached a unanimous decision - i.e., the one wanted by the prosecution.

Jurors, please don't let the government agent judge get away with this tactic. Remember, this tyrant in a black dress can't do anything to you for your vote. Nothing! It is the individual juror's right and constitutional duty to make his or her own decision as to the verdict. Each juror deciding *freely and independently* is the only possible way to reach a fair and righteous judgment.

If, as a juror, you find that you are unable to accept the decisions of your fellow jurors, things may get a bit rough for you. But, stand your righteous ground. **IT IS BOTH YOUR DUTY AND YOUR LEGAL RIGHT TO STAND UP FOR WHAT YOU BELIEVE TO BE RIGHT.** In the Supreme Court case of *U.S. vs Dougherty*, we read, "The Jury has an unreviewable and unreviewable

power...to acquit in disregard of the instructions on the law given by the trial judge."

So, don't give in! When seated as a juror, you are accountable only to Almighty God! Do what is right; refusing to serve any other master, regardless of who may get upset with you. Working as police officers in the dangerous, crime-ridden streets of South Phoenix, Arizona, we cops had a saying: "They can kill ya, but they can't eat ya!" Well, the government agent judge, as evil and tyrannical as he might be, *can't do either one!*.....even though he may try to convince you he can. Strike a blow against tyranny in government. You're on good, firm, legal grounds to vote your conscience!

And another thing: Sometimes it's other jurors who will be tough on you.....wanting you to compromise, even! But when you know you are right, don't! Remember also that it is absolutely wrong to trade one's jury vote for another's on particular issues during deliberation. Stick to what you believe is right on each and every count. **COMPROMISE IS NOT JUSTICE.** On each separate point, the defendant is either guilty or not guilty, and you must vote accordingly.

Believe us old cops: If you *were to* just give in and "go-along" instead of doing what YOU know to be right, you will always hate yourself for not being strong enough to do what your mind, heart and morals told you was right and fair. We police officers have known many jurors who have suffered and lived very unhappy lives after allowing themselves to be coerced (whether by fellow jurors or by biased government agents) into just "going along to get along". **DON'T DO IT!**

13) THE BANNING OF TAPE RECORDERS

How many of us have tried to take a tape recorder into a courtroom? Ever heard a veritable shriek arise from court personnel at the mere sight of one? The very thought of a tape recorder in the courtroom can be about as terrifying to a corrupt judge as a holy cross is to a vampire!



JUDGE SEEING A TAPE RECORDER

The tape recorder is so powerful, in fact, that it can cause a judge to literally run from the room in a panic, as if he just saw a honest citizen juror who's fully aware of his rightful duties and powers! If you watch carefully, in pulling out a tape recorder,

you might even see several guards go for

their guns! Such reaction, akin to absolute terror, is because there is nothing more scary in the world of corrupt government officials and agents than to have their misdeeds documented on tape by "the great unwashed public". Nowhere is this more true than in our courts.

Criminal judges and prosecutors, at times, have been known to secretly "doctor" a court transcript, in order to cover for some inadvertent, recorded exposure of any part of their illegal conspiracy. Allowing John Q. Citizen to record proceedings for himself is apt to make such

conspiratorial conduct far more difficult and risky, and not so easily gotten away with. This, too, occurs most commonly in relation to trials of *political* detainees - "whistle blowers" and such the government needs to be rid of.

Many police detectives and other officers will be familiar with this criminal tactic as a result of the many cases they see come before "the king's court". Reading the "official" court transcript following a particular trial, they may notice certain things missing which they know for sure had been entered into the record, but which now have "magically" disappeared.

Don't believe it? There are numerous cases of such criminal activity, but here are just a few: Charles M. Nice, Jr., judge of the tenth Judicial Circuit of Alabama, was suspended for six months for ordering the court reporter to delete large portions of a court transcript. For another example, see U.S. Court of Appeals, Chicago, 810 F 2d 72. This is a case where a Wisconsin state circuit court judge, his clerk, and court reporter created an entirely fictitious transcript of a hearing which never was held. But, deemed as "above the law" by the international controlling elite, a corrupt U.S. District Court judge dismissed the suit against these criminal government insiders, on the basis of **absolute judicial immunity from prosecution.** This judicial immunity "law" had been voted in by *lawyer/congressmen* to protect fellow *lawyer/judges*, all of whom are counted on to be both pliable and corrupt.

Therefore - sorry, folks: No "VILE", "TROUBLE-SOME" TAPE RECORDERS ALLOWED in court today!

BEWARE OF MAKING EXCUSES FOR JUDGES.

Understandably, sometimes judges can even be our personal friends. There are several whom we ourselves personally know and like. That aside however, let's see if we can put this into a clear and simple perspective: As we all understand, a person's right to "a fair and impartial hearing by a jury of his peers" is one of the most important personal safeguards guaranteed us under the Constitution. So, if we "lowly" lawmen know this, can anyone seriously believe that highly-educated individuals like professional lawyers and lawyer/judges - who have made the study and application of the government system and the laws of this Republic their life-long work - **WOULD NOT KNOW IT?!** Anybody??!

A fine attorney friend of ours by the name of Michael Minns has written an excellent and important work entitled *The Underground Lawyer*. Every officer and every private American should read this book. In it, attorney Minns details the history of our jury system. To paraphrase a bit of this history: Going back *some two hundred years before the Magna Carta was signed in England*, Emperor Conrad of Germany had already established the **guarantee of trial by jury!** This first system allowed for the citizen jury, not the government, to determine all civil justice and fairness - *due process*, in other words! Notice, if you will, that even back then, there was the belief that **the people** had the best basic perception of what was good and what was evil, including an understanding of property rights, that laid the groundwork for the *viability* of such a people's jury system. This system was so fair and equitable that a nineteenth-century scholar by the name of Lysander Spooner wrote extolling the great virtue of this system in these terms: "If the Jury does not judge the law, the

facts, and *all* of the evidence, then they are merely the tools, rather than a barrier against the tyranny and oppression of the government."

Can you imagine our present tyrannical government aristocracy trusting the American people that much? "NOT ON YOUR TIN BADGE, OFFICER!" We've posed this discussion before, but again, if any of you "Johnny Laws" have ever *dreamed* of being a part of a Martial Law action, we suggest that you just wait a short while till these same power-crazed international elitists have tricked the remainder of our unwitting and foolish fellow Americans into voluntarily turning in their guns.....in exchange for King Bush's "**kinder, gentler nation**"! ('Course the government will probably need all those guns to help fight its "war on terrorism". Yeah, right!!)

But, what the honorable Mr. Spooner wrote regarding the importance of the jury, reflects exactly the spirit that *used* to reign in America, before the elitists decided that they themselves were far more wise and could better decide who should go free and who should be found guilty.....of "crimes" against "society", against "the State" or more accurately, against their own criminal aristocracy!

THOSE WHO WOULD BE KINGS



A case in point: In 1982 Aid & Abet publisher, Officer Jack McLamb, an active-duty police officer at the time, in addition to being director of a national, educational police association, was interviewed on public television in Arizona.

Before the interview, Officer Jack and the TV host, who was a local attorney, had a moment to talk. They were discussing present problems with the criminal justice system. Officer Jack recalls the exchange as follows: "I had presented to him the 'outlandish' idea that the people's jury, rather than the judge, should actually be allowed to decide the outcome of a jury trial by utilizing their full lawful powers, one of which was *Jury Nullification*, i.e. judging both the law and the facts of a case, and reviewing *all* pertinent evidence, *all* witnesses, etc. This lawyer's very stern and egotistical reply to me was, 'The jury is not intelligent enough to be trusted with such powers!' I would have to say that our relationship sort of went downhill from there. And I can also tell you that, given the nature of our present elitist-minded judicial system, a lawyer with an attitude like that, is perfect material for a politically-appointed government agent judgeship!"

Comments like that gives one a glimpse of the size and severity of the problems we face with respect to our current imperial government-controlled judiciary. But, let's turn to another quote from our nineteenth-century legal scholar, Lysander Spooner: "**It is not only the right and duty of juries to judge what are the facts, what is the law, and what is the moral intent of the accused,**

but it is also their right and their primary and paramount duty to judge the justice of the law, and to hold all laws invalid that are, in their (jury's) opinions, unjust or oppressive, and to hold all persons guiltless in violating, or resisting the execution of, such laws."

Think about it. Occasionally, law officers themselves are accused of crimes and find themselves facing a jury. What if it were you, dear reader? Wouldn't you yourself prefer that a *truly independent* jury of your peers decide your case rather than a *facade* of a jury - one in name only, craftily selected and secretly controlled by a single, compliant government agent judge? As for this editor, give me a jury of my peers anytime! This means local friends and neighbors - their names randomly **DRAWN OUT OF A HAT**. No screening, no qualifications involved, other than just being my competent and fair-minded fellow citizens..... and none of those "*involved*", **judicial control mechanisms** we've been discussing in this publication. Simply a fair, unbiased people's jury.....just the kind our Founders had in mind all along!

ARE JUDGES AND PROSECUTORS ALL BAD?

No, but SOME are VERY bad! As hard-hitting as this report has been, our intention has not been to label all judges and all lawyers as "bad people". While it is absolutely true that nearly all government agent judges use some unlawful, secret controls - - and much of the time, at that - - we recognize that this shameful "power grab" has resulted from long decades of **well-planned, gradual and incremental encroachments**. This fairly monstrous judicial "empire" has been inspired and built, over long periods of time, not so much by the lawyers and judges themselves, as by the hidden, powerful global-elite forces operating behind the scenes, who know just exactly how to lure, entice, mis-train and then *use* pliable judges and lawyers, to accomplish their own (secret) purposes of control. Most lawmen know at least one good judge somewhere and some good lawyers, too, who will not commit felony crimes and help destroy America, in order to please the international criminal elite controlling our state and federal governments. Sadly though, of course, these *good* ones do not get promoted up to the higher courts. We do honor, bless and commend those few lawyers and lawyer/judges who love Freedom above servitude, and Freedom above their own personal fortunes.

In speaking about corrupt government agent judges and prosecutors - *agenda-driven* judges and prosecutors - Supreme Court Justice Byron White in *Duncan v. Louisiana*, 391 US 145, 156 (1968) stated, "**Providing an accused with the right to be tried by a jury of his peers gave him an inestimable safeguard against the corrupt or overzealous prosecutor and against the compliant, biased, or eccentric judge.**" He was speaking, of course, about a *fully-informed* "Jury of one's peers"!

The single, main purpose of our study here has been to show that, regardless of who or what is to blame, we in America are *past the point* where the prescribed, all-important People's Jury has been intentionally rendered powerless - such that the good people who report for jury duty, not knowing this, just sit there and become "rubber stamps" for the criminal government "song and dance team"- - a sold-out, corrupted government judge and prosecutor. Interestingly, in the thinking of the elite controllers, the jury **must continue to be there**, for even if


it's a farce, it serves as "window-dressing", making it appear that the people are still in control. After all, for an eventual, complete takeover of the nation by the internationalists, the unwitting public must go on believing they are free and independent, having a say in what happens in their communities and nation. (God forbid, the mindless masses should awaken to their encroaching enslavement before the take-over is complete!)

It's all very much like the fraud involved where our people still believe they have an actual choice in a two-party political system, when they cast a vote for a Republican Socialist or a Democratic Socialist. As many of our fellow law officers today know, this hasn't really been true for decades. The goal of those who control each party is one and the same, precisely because the elitists behind each of the parties are one and the same - their end goal being a "utopian" totalitarian (slave) system under a Communist United Nations - yes, the very same anti-Christ world government foretold millennia ago in the Holy Bible.

The People must be the guardians of their sacred documents, the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and of the rule of law (courts, etc.).

- Lawyer/judge, Catherine Crier,
May 22, 2006

TAKING BACK AMERICA BY RETURNING POWER TO THE PEOPLE



Alexander Hamilton, in 1794, urged that "Jurors should acquit even against the judge's instruction...if in exercising their judgment with discretion and honesty, they have a clear conviction that the charge of the court is wrong."

In order to return the power to the people, we must find a way to inform the sovereign public about how

they are being regularly and tyrannically defrauded of their lawful powers when serving on a jury. *This must be done for the sake of us all!*

Rational people everywhere recognize that we have allowed the most monumentally corrupt and evil people to gain control over our local, state and federal governmental systems, and that indeed our "One Nation Under God" is gone. - - all because we-the-people, through fear and apathy, have allowed it. Hand in hand with this, it is recognized that our freedom and independence, too, are almost gone.

However, on a very positive note, we can give thanks that the few freedoms we have left - - the right to serve as an *educated, independent* juror being a BIG ONE - - are quite enough to restore what has been lost, IF we will act NOW. So.....let's get on with it!

NO UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND TYRANNICAL LAWS CAN BE USED AGAINST A SOVEREIGN AMERICAN PEOPLE, IF WE POLICE OFFICERS AND SOLDIERS.....ALONG WITH THE PEOPLE'S JURY.....WILL NOT ENFORCE THEM!

One great example of tyranny currently facing us is the horrendously unconstitutional U.S.A. Patriot Act, and the equally unconstitutional Homeland (in)Security Agency. Can any lawman or soldier believe that today in the good ole USA, good people can be picked up for being "disagreeable" to the international aristocracy in control of the federal government? Once HOOKED AND BOOKED, those disagreeable persons may never be allowed to contact the outside world again; never be charged with a crime nor brought to trial, and be permanently hidden away in some CIA dungeon in a foreign country.....all because someone high-up in the international elite chain-of-command did not like their politics, religious faith, lifestyle, etc.. All it takes today is for them to be labeled "suspected terrorists" or "suspected enemy combatants", and they can be put away for good.

No big deal, you say? Well, in the near future, those fellow Americans may be some of your own colleagues in uniform, or members of your own family - GONE, with never a chance to prove their innocence.....NEVER. Please don't say it can't happen in America, for this system is already in place today. Remember king Bush's "You're either with us or against us" speech?! Does that tell you anything? And let us never forget that secret FBI brochure handed out to law enforcement several years ago, showing all kinds of Americans with differing belief systems (including Christians, Constitutionalists and patriots) actually listed there as suspected domestic terrorists. (We have copies of this FBI brochure, with detailed analysis/commentary, if anyone would like one. Send a request to Aid & Abet, along with 5.00 cash, please.)

HOW THE JURY LOST OUT.....OVER A CENTURY AGO

It is interesting to note that it was one single, self-serving judge of the U.S. Supreme Court who in 1895 stole away from the American Jury its right to be instructed (and reminded by the court at each trial) that they *do indeed* have the power to nullify bad law, and take responsibility for how a specific law may be applied to a particular case. This very bold, corrupt judge then bestowed upon his fellow "club members" (lower court judges) the choice and prerogative to decide henceforth *whether or not* to tell the jury of their full, lawful powers.


This was done most likely because juries back then kept deciding in favor of the interests of the American people, instead of what the government elitists of that time wanted. **Question:** *Does the Supreme Court have the right to simply hide or strip away the lawful powers and unalienable rights of our sovereign People?!*

As we have already discussed, it is through this kind of illicit, judicial activism, that power-hungry elitists are able to protect certain fellow criminals, promote certain un-American political goals, and at the same time, *punish* other selected persons or groups, crushing any opposition to their international elitist agenda.

President/King George the Bush, has told us recently several times what that "agenda" is. It's the same as his

Daddy's: a "utopian" one-world government. It will be installed, of course, with him and his anti-Christ, criminal cronies at the helm, in complete control of all the peoples of the world, under the United Nations. We should listen up and believe them completely when they tell us, "You won't need constitutional protections in this new world order." Now, that's an understatement, since there won't be people's rights of *any* kind.

BELIEVE IT OR NOT, ONE LAWYER TOLD THE TRUTH!



It was some 15 years ago already that a real live attorney in Phoenix, Arizona told the truth in this following brief article, affirming and explaining the right of a sovereign people to know and utilize Jury Nullification.

The article had appeared in the state's largest newspaper, the *Arizona Republic & Gazette*. Rather

amazing it is, but true. Read it and cheer!

Jury Has Power to Nullify Law

At the end of most jury trials, the judge gives the jury instructions regarding the law applicable to the case. The jury is then excused to begin its deliberations and reach a verdict.

Jury verdict research indicates that most juries give great weight to the judge's instructions about the law. They take seriously the charge to apply the facts presented during the trial to the law as described to them by the judge.

Under our legal system, however, juries need not be controlled by the law. They may reach any verdict they like, notwithstanding what many would consider to be the obvious conclusion to be drawn from the evidence applied to the law.

In legal circles, this concept sometimes is referred to as "jury nullification". The term is used to describe the ability of a jury to effectively nullify the law in connection with the case they are hearing.

This little-known principle is well established in our legal system. It predates the American Revolution. If a jury believes a law is unjust, or that circumstances justify disregarding it, the jury generally has the power to reach a verdict that is apparently inconsistent with the traditional application of facts to law. Most legal scholars agree that this power is one of the strengths of our judicial system. It is a corrective feature that permits ordinary citizens to do justice when unusual circumstances arise.

American juries have enormous power, and most of the time it is exerted responsibly. Juries may be reluctant to reach a first-degree murder conviction where the accused disconnected a respirator from a terminally ill loved one. The power of jury nullification permits a "not guilty" verdict.

[Editor's note: Fellow lawmen and soldiers, does not this article give us hope for the future? Quite obviously, Mr.

Van O' Steen ranks with the more honorable, "America-first" attorneys, for whose assistance Aid & Abet receives requests regularly. Perhaps it is a little amazing, but Attorney O'Steen did not end up buried with Jimmy Hoffa! Still alive and well, he may be reached currently at the firm of O'Steen and Harrison, 300 W. Clarendon Avenue, Ste. 400, Phoenix, Arizona 85013 (800) 883-8888.]

SUPPORT FULLY INFORMED JURY ASSOCIATION and AMERICAN JURY INSTITUTE (FIJA/AJI)

In our quest for reclaiming, constitutionally, our American judicial system, one very important thing we must all do is join with our neighbors and other fellow Americans in a campaign to force less-than-honest judges and prosecutors in our respective states to stop lying, and begin telling juries the truth about their full, lawful powers and duties, just as Attorney O' Steen has done. FIJA/AJI is a truly marvelous, national association which stands expertly prepared and more-than-ready to assist us in this vital task. And they need our help and encouragement, as well. Please call or write them in care of: P.O. Box 5570, Helena, Montana 59604. (406) 442-7800. E-mail: aji@fija.org, Web: www.fija.org.

WE-THE-PEOPLE DO HAVE THE POWER

We, the American people must remember that our forefathers, at great sacrifice to themselves, gave us the ultimate veto power against exactly the kind of despotic government leaders we have today. The people's jury is the next-to-last protection against tyrannical rulers (the very last being our guns).

The knowledgeable and honorable American juror has the lawful power to stop these international criminal elitists **non-violently**. The jury represents our last hope before resorting to arms to put down the autocratic robber barons working daily to take our freedoms from us. When allowed to function as designed, the sovereign people's jury **does work**. We cops have seen it work. When knowing and exercising its full range of rights and powers, the People's Jury has *more* power than Congress, the President, or even the Supreme Court, because it has the final veto power over all acts of the legislature (i.e., its laws). **This is why our government leaders fear and hate the jury so much.** The jury can (flat-out) *veto* the criminal acts of the wannabe potentates currently roaming the halls of our State Houses and the nation's Capitol - most of them apparently just *dreaming* of the day that America returns to the King's Star Chamber (courts) of un-jolly old England.

As true as all of this is, *absolutely everything hinges upon - and nothing of good can happen unless* - fully-informed, clear-thinking citizens of integrity and courage actually do step up to serve on the jury. Pray about this, utilizing every opportunity to serve.....then do whatever honorable thing you have to, to keep a government agent judge and prosecutor from robbing you of your right. (Yes, that *may* include deceiving a deceiver.) Remember, you *could be* the only chance a particular defendant has for a fair trial. Can you handle that?.....to safeguard a fellow American??

BUT WILL WE USE IT?

That is the question. Are we going to grab hold and...

utilize the lawful powers which many fellow Americans died to give us? Or are we just going to wait around until another bloody revolution is required to win back our freedoms?? Will WE take the time NOW to share this information with fellow Americans very likely to be called by government to serve on a jury one day soon? (This special report you now have in hand is a tool that can help, so please share copies wherever you can.)

Forgive us for being unable to resist the urge to set before you once again that powerfully eloquent statement of British Prime Minister, Sir Winston Churchill, by which he rallied the people of England, prior to entry into WWII. If we can just set aside for a moment a lot of what we know of the less-than-honorable, extenuating circumstances surrounding that era and endeavor, and focus just on the Prime Minister's words, we see that he expresses a passion that even we, as truly Peace-and-Freedom-loving Americans can identify, adopt and apply to our own day, as we face and take on the battles at hand for God and country. Mr. Churchill said:

"If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed, if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not so costly, you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance for survival. There may be a worse case. You may have to fight when there is no chance for victory, because it is better to perish than to live as slaves."

Such must be the battle cry of all men and women who value freedom. As of this time, we still *can* stand and "fight", *non-violently*.....and it still is "not so costly". So this now is the time for each *informed* juror to step forward and protect from unjust laws and prosecution all innocent fellow Americans charged in political trials.

PROSECUTING CRIMINAL JUDGES?

Chandler v. Judicial Council of the 10th Circuit, 398 U.S. 74, 90 S. Ct. 1648, 26 L. Ed. 2d 100

Supreme Court Justice Douglas, in his dissenting opinion at page 140 said, "If (federal judges) break the law, they can be prosecuted."

Justice Black, in his dissenting opinion at page 141) said, "Judges, like other people, can be tried, convicted and punished for crimes....The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this U.S. Constitution."

Today, however, the power-elite have in place a multitude of laws and regulations which make it very difficult, if not impossible, to prosecute judges for any of their criminal conduct. But, once sufficient numbers of "we the people" are informed and become aware of such criminal activity, we can get those "laws" repealed through our "elected things". Wouldn't that be wonderful? If we could prosecute judges who, with criminal intent and forethought, commit the crime of Jury Tampering, it would certainly send a message to other judges tempted to follow in the same path.

"The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." - Sir Edmund Burke

SO WHAT DO YOU SAY - LET'S DO SOMETHING!

[Editor's note: Following here now is the story of a rather harrowing experience which one knowledgeable 66-year-old American citizen had recently, as a result of having served as a juror on a criminal case. Unbelievably, after this good citizen juror helped save a young Indian boy from prison *for lack of evidence* this lady found herself charged with felony perjury, carrying a 1-to-14-year prison term, and 50,000 fine, if convicted. As her story explains, the charge came as a result of the stand she took during jury deliberations, wherein she expressed to fellow jurors the considerable difficulty she had with the way certain aspects of the trial had been conducted. You will want to read this story as a perfect illustration of exactly the kinds of government corruption and judicial tyranny that we lawmen are exposing in this report.

This criminal charge brought against our dear Aid & Abet associate Carol Asher, raised such a howl of protest among the American people (and even abroad) that the magistrate, at the conclusion of her evidentiary hearing, found a way to let the case drop, stating "not enough evidence" to support the charge of perjury and willful obstruction of justice. This, after a team of specially-appointed state investigators had invested untold hours over a period of some seven months, spending untold thousands of dollars of taxpayer funds gathering the "criminal evidence" for their case, and already costing this social security-supported, former school teacher and long-time Aid & Abet volunteer over \$16,000.00 in legal fees for just the initial two hearings. (What might the final tab have been had the case gone all the way through trial, followed perhaps even by appeals?) As sister Carol will tell you, we are extremely grateful that the charge was dismissed, for bad as it was, things indeed could have been so much worse. We again want to thank everyone who supported us so generously and caringly, in so many ways, throughout the tyrannical experience.]

Seems It's All About LAW:

True Law, Hierarchy of Law, Supremacy of Law

by Carol J. Asher, March 18, 2006

Needless to say, there is *plenty* of "the difficult", on *all* sides of the situation, when one is facing a charge as serious as felony perjury, such as the State of Idaho recently brought against me.

In all that experience, though, one of the things I found hardest of all was not being free to speak about the case, even enough to correct partially erroneous reports, or respond to the numerous, concerned inquiries of



caring friends. (*You have the right to remain silent, and anything you say can be used against you in a court of law*, is the immediate reminder given the accused, thus curtailing one's free speech for the duration.) I'm delighted and so grateful that Divine Providence was unspeakably merciful in my case! Owing in very large part to the fact that a *virtual army of caring Americans* literally stormed Heaven with their prayers, even while storming the highest political offices of the State of Idaho with their outrage, the charge against me was dismissed just 7 ½ (tough) weeks later. How many times should I write here the word *Hallelujah* in response to that?!

Having looked forward to a time when I *could* more freely share some of my story, when that time came, I found that I hardly knew where to begin. It seems it would be far easier, free of space considerations, to just write a fair-sized "book", recounting any number of related details and observations, beginning with my summons to jury duty last June and continuing through all the significant events of my own criminal case. Instead, the very definite space considerations we do have here will quite nicely force me to confine myself to a discussion of just certain *principles* and *values* that this judicial experience has highlighted for me, and re-impressed upon me. Thanks to alternative [patriot] news publications, talk radio, and the internet, many readers will likely already have gained a fair understanding of the basic story happenings. But here, in the main, is the story as I experienced it.

Had I been free to speak about the case during the months spent under criminal charge, my first endeavor would have been to correct and clarify certain misinformation and half-truths that were circulating concerning, for example, the supposed *reason* I had been criminally charged. I contend that it was *not* for my having voted to acquit the defendant (in the July 2005 trial); three fellow jurors voted for acquittal as well, for the simple reason that the prosecution had totally failed to prove *awareness, knowledge* and thus *culpability* on the part of the defendant. (Incidentally, in light of that failure, how the eight other jurors could vote to convict was sadly mystifying to me.) It is true that throughout the trial, the prosecution had made it abundantly clear that it would very much *like* us to return a unanimous verdict of guilty, but, to my knowledge, at no time was the jury pressured in any way regarding our vote.

Instead, an entirely different matter arose in the course of that July trial which would prove pivotal for me, and become most troubling of all. Testimony revealed how a passing city police officer, recognizing our young defendant standing in a small roadside park, confronted and arrested him there, apparently based upon an outstanding warrant for some sort of probation violation. Things became problematic for me when continuing testimony revealed that this officer, joined now by a county sheriff's deputy as backup, forced the keys from the young man, in order to search the pickup which he had driven to the scene, parked, and looked upon exiting, prior to any police arrival. Rights as protected under the 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution came to mind for me, and immediately made me question. A *nice* feature of this trial was that jurors were invited to write out and submit (by way of the judge) questions they might have for any witness taking the stand. The question I wrote out for the

first of the two arresting officers was, "*Officer, in your understanding of the law, was it lawful and proper police procedure for you to have force searched the defendant's vehicle without first obtaining a warrant to do so?*"

Instead of reading the question aloud to the court (as was his general practice with most all others) the judge merely said that this question was an inquiry concerning the legality of the vehicle search. He went on to explain that there had been a pre-trial conference at which it was agreed that the search was legal. With that, the judge went on to the next question, neither requiring nor allowing the officer on the stand to respond. Unsatisfied and undeterred, I presented the exact same question in writing as the second arresting officer was on the stand. Without reading it aloud, the judge announced that the question again concerned the warrantless search of the vehicle, which ("as has already been explained", he said) was declared lawful. Thus, the second police officer was not required nor even allowed to answer.

As the trial recessed at the close of the day, I handed to the judge a third written inquiry, this one intended for him personally, literally *pleading* for a more satisfying explanation - one that might set my mind at ease - concerning *what precise considerations* - perhaps some validity unknown to me - made that search indeed lawful. As trial got underway the following morning, the judge did announce that a juror was still troubled about the legality of the vehicle search, but that, since the matter had already been settled prior to trial, it was not even to be considered as evidence, nor enter into the jury's deliberations as it prepared to render a verdict. So it was that with my mental/moral conflict still unresolved, courtroom proceedings concluded later that day, and jury deliberations began.

Among a few other things that for brevity I will leave unmentioned here, I let it be known within the jury room that - - pre-trial agreement or not - - I was still troubled by that warrantless vehicle search. "After all", I reasoned, "we've all been summoned here to trial as a direct result of that forced search having yielded .15 of a gram of crystal meth, even though law enforcement had originally detained and arrested our young defendant on a totally different, unrelated matter." This sort of comment caused certain other jurors to remind me (like I needed reminding?) that we had been instructed not to question the legality of the search nor consider it at all. It was my insistence upon doing so that caused me soon to be reported to authorities, criminally investigated, and brought up on the charge that I did face.

Dear readers, I entitled this article as I did because I believe that the incident I've been discussing here comes down to a matter of Law. Meaning what? While not generally taught in public education today, there does exist a most definite hierarchy of law. In fact, bottom line, there is but one Law: the Natural Law of the Creator. We are familiar with this Law as codified in the Ten Commandments, but which Jesus managed to narrow down to just two: to love or honor your Creator, and to do right by your brother, respecting the rights he innately possesses as a child of the Creator. Now, we know that the United States of America is the world's *first government ever* established by its founders expressly to both honor the Creator's Law, and safeguard these recognized, unalienable rights of man. The Constitution our Founders

set up gave no rights at all, but rather simply *guaranteed those that already were*, while strictly requiring that governments be among the first to honor and protect such rights.

So how does my particular judicial experience relate to all this? Well, for me it has served to say that *we either have a Supreme Law operative in America or we don't*. If we do, then courts are either bound by this Supreme Law or they are not. That is the question that needs to be looked at, answered, and held to as standard. For, *by no means are all "laws" equal*. Supreme Law must always be the judge of lower (man-made) law. As I saw it in my little experience, God's Law of "do no harm to your brother" had been merely re-stated (for one place) within the 4th Amendment, to guarantee a person's protection against unlawful searches and seizures. So, for example, when some police officials and a judge and some lawyers declare a particular property search to be "lawful", I myself (as juror/judge) need to check out and know for certain if that is true. And how is it that I can know? Only by running the age-old test: If whatever men declare proves to be in alignment with (i.e., does not violate in any way) God's Law of love of neighbor, and (in this instance) that "neighbor's" rights as guaranteed under 4th Amendment protections, then I can relax and be in agreement that the police action is indeed righteous and lawful. But if, after seriously and sincerely weighing all aspects of the matter, my conscience does not so direct me, then I find myself facing a problem. For us American "kings and queens of government" to accept a standard any less than that, is to participate in destroying the moral fabric of our God-ordained Republic, and further erode and dissipate the *example* that America was meant to offer the world.

Often we hear many of the most learned and dedicated patriots insisting that the courts in America have been taken over, have ceased to be ours, and that therefore the Constitution no longer has any bearing there. One can hardly argue the point. However, as true as that may be in the plan and the practice of the usurpers, I certainly don't think that our surrendering to the situation (thus *in a sense validating* the takeover) is the correct response. No amount of usurpation can ever make a wrong a right, and it is for us who do understand the one and only legitimate Law and power of righteousness, to hold to that *and only that* - with firm but loving insistence - for as long as it may take for wayward officials (of whatever government stripe) to turn, submit, and begin to do right. Every situation, such as the one I found myself in recently, brings with it a *number* of opportunities for us to offer and demonstrate correct principle: to drive home to public officials (as well as to more of the public itself) that there is but ONE supreme, lawful way binding on us all; and that the sooner they learn to honor and live by It, the happier they will be personally, as well as our nation as a whole. The fact that many officials may not yet care, nor yet be ready to listen, is not our major concern. *Our job* is simply to seize opportunities to plant some seeds - some of which may germinate in due time. Often rolling around in my head is that wonderful Scriptural promise, something to the effect that *eventually "every knee shall bow"* (to God's Way). That goal seems obviously a very long way off, but still, what a glorious future for us to envision! You and I, in our lifetimes, are given opportunities to nudge that

dream along.....just a little closer to reality. Can we think of a *better* reason for living?

SUGGESTIONS FOR PROSPECTIVE JURORS

In light of what it brought down upon me, I wouldn't exactly advise prospective jurors to speak or act quite as I did in my own recent jury service. (Understatement of the year, perhaps?!) But there definitely are some things that all knowledgeable jurors can do (for Constitutional Law in America) *without* putting ourselves in such legal jeopardy. Let's look, contrastingly, at two such possible courses of action. Perhaps it's the "old teacher" in me that makes me a little partial to the first approach, that of offering a challenge to the judge. But, I willingly admit that, in certain court cases, the second approach - that of doing whatever necessary to actually get to serve on the jury - is *even more important*.

Concerning the first approach: As already discussed elsewhere in this newsletter, it is now highly standardized practice in courts throughout America for judges to qualify and instruct prospective jurors using much the same manner and terms as occurred in my own recent experience. So.....just as courts now follow a standard script, perhaps we prospective jurors can come with a brief one of our own.

At a critical point in the jury selection process, the judge will say something as follows, which here, incidentally, is taken verbatim from the court transcript of the July, 2005 case on which I served: Quote: "*Now, ladies and gentlemen, it's my duty to instruct you on the law. And you're required to follow the law, even if you think it's a dumb law, or even if you don't think it is the law. And is there anyone who will be unwilling to apply the law as I instruct you it is, even if you may not agree with it or think it's a dumb law?*" (Hard to believe what you just read? Anyone can check the public record!)

Once the judge has posed that sort of question, you might signal to speak, and when recognized, say something like this: "*Well, I certainly want to be able to follow your instructions, your honor, but I do have one question.*" ("What is your question?", he or she may say.) "*Well, first of all, so far in this proceeding, we know none of the facts of the case to be tried, nor what law will be applied to render judgment and reach a verdict. So, while I can't really promise anything at this point, my question, specifically, is this: If chosen to serve on this case, what am I to do if, after serious and thorough consideration of all the evidence presented, and the law as we are instructed to apply it, I sincerely believe that that law violates in some way the U.S. Constitution?*"

How the judge will respond to that remains to be seen in each instance. About the worst that can happen, though, is that he or she may simply say, "Sir" (or Ma'am), *thank you for coming. You may be excused.*" (If space allowed, I would love to tell you the almost fun details of how this actually happened to me, as a would-be juror, in a California courtroom many years ago.) Just like back then, so also today, taking such an approach is likely to end any chances you had of serving on that jury. Not good. On the positive side, though, if allowed to say anywhere near that much, you will have succeeded in placing into the court record a pretty powerful message, along with helping to educate perhaps 75 people (or more)

present in the room. There can be many variations to this approach, and any number of similar questions one can choose to present. But imagine the powerful, cumulative effect, if in every courthouse across America, just one aware citizen were to so act, each time a court convened to prepare for trial. Since, as they say, "it's a numbers game", it may not take too, too long before there would have to be some changes made.

However, as already hinted, there is an obvious downside to this approach. As has been stressed repeatedly throughout this report, the honest, knowledgeable and independent thinker you've just shown yourself to be is exactly the kind of person needed to fill every jury panel. This is especially true in cases of *political* trials where the defendant, being *morally innocent*, deserves and needs at least one juror to recognize that fact, and vote in his or her defense. Considering both options, I personally see it as a tough call which choice to make. Not knowing the nature of a case ahead of time makes it impossible to know ahead of time which cases are most going to need you, and which can just as well be handled by *any* competent and fair-minded (but not particularly aware) American. While most cases are of the latter kind, still, for the sake of being on hand to render crucial service when it truly is most needed, our second option may well take priority. I still say education in the courtroom is good and needed. But biting one's tongue and remaining silent, so as to be able to actually serve on a jury is often even more needed. The shameful, sorry plight of literally *hundreds* of totally innocent American prisoners certainly attests to this. Challenging and "educating" judges may need to be done another way, at another time.

TWO THINGS IN CLOSING:

I would first like to thank the wonderful folks who head up and serve at the Fully Informed Jury Association (FIJA) and the American Jury Institute (AJI) to whom goes a large share of credit for teaching correct principles to me and to hundreds of thousands of other concerned Americans. Our readers are encouraged to contact FIJA/AJI for more information, as well as to support their efforts. aji@fija.org. Write them in care of P.O. Box 5570, Helena, Montana 59604, or call (406) 442-7800.

I also again want to thank each and all of the caring, generous people who so strongly supported me through the criminal charge I faced, and who even now continue to do so. Although a tough experience, I've never felt more loved and supported in all my life. Every encouraging card, letter and phone call, every prayer and defense "dollar" donated is appreciated more than I can say. Many of you I've been able to thank in writing, but I now want to give special mention to those who supported anonymously. Heaven will know who you are! And if I may mention it rather publicly here, the support I've received beginning day #1 from my good friend and volunteer "boss", Jack McLamb, has been absolutely incredible. THANK YOU, JACK!

As I've said to some of you in other places, I'll say again: I surely am relieved and thankful that it is our Heavenly Father Who really repays all such giving. His richest blessings to you all!

"Where an excess of (government) power prevails, neither property nor person is safe or duly respected. And no man is safe in his opinions, his person, his faculties, or his possessions."

- James Madison,
27 March, 1792

AMERICAN HERO, MICHAEL NEW, ATTACKED BY DESPOTIC JUDGES



Embattled former Army Spc. Michael New, together with his family and support team, has withstood repeated attacks by government authorities in the nation's courts, both military and civilian. Having endured first of all the crushing blow of a court martial ruling meted out to him by ruthless, corrupt judges in the military courts, Michael's legal defense action continues unabated, as appeals move

forward now in the civilian courts.

Excellent defense attorney, Dr. Herb Titus, aided by the tireless efforts of Michael's loyal parents, Daniel and Suzanne New, continues to do battle against the lawless machinations of globalist-minded military officials, and despotic, sold-out judges at every level.

As most of our readers will recall, it was already more than a decade ago, in early 1995, that an impeccably honorable U.S. Army medic, Spc. Michael New, first entered the glare of the world spotlight, as news spread of his courageous refusal to obey unlawful orders issued to him by his military superiors.

Serving on active duty in Germany at that time, Michael's unit one day received orders to fall out, not in traditional U.S. "greens", but in UN blue, complete with cap and other global insignia. This directive was a part of the unit's orders to prepare for deployment to Macedonia (in former Yugoslavia) where they would serve as mercenaries under the command of a Finnish General. Such an order our brother Michael knew to be in total violation of the Uniform Code of Military Injustice (UCMJ), since any such foreign military general would owe no allegiance whatever to the U.S. Constitution nor to the American people It is designed to protect. Little more than 20 years old at the time, *Spc. New was the only U.S. soldier in the unit* to mount any kind of resistance to this unlawful, treasonous order. Michael's sincere and respectful appeals to his superiors for reprieve - and

reassignment - were met with only refusal, and later, by threats of court martial.

SO EVIL AND TREASONOUS

This heart-rending case is an example, again, of how judges with honor could have stood up for American sovereignty, for our soldiers, and for the UCMJ. Their neglect and refusal to do that has shown them to be among all the other traitors whose first allegiance is to their own personal, professional careers, for which they are more than willing to sell out, in service to the internationalists whose ultimate goal is to place America and Her people under an atheistic, totalitarian "new world order".

In the same tyrannical spirit as the military judges, treasonous judges presiding in the civilian appeals courts refused to allow Michael's attorneys to enter into the record any of the available hard evidence proving the military assignment in question to have been in blatant violation of the UCMJ.....evidence which would have completely exonerated Spc. Michael New. (The UCMJ stipulates that if a soldier knows an order is unlawful, he is duty-bound to disobey it.) So, the proof that Michael New had not only an absolute right, but a duty as well, to refuse his military superiors' unlawful orders is right there in black and white within the pages of the UCMJ manual, yet treasonist judges ignored it totally. They chose arbitrarily not to allow Michael New to be shown innocent.

Sounds exactly like the kind of treatment former FBI agent Richard Taus received in his "trial", as discussed here in earlier pages. Please remember that, when it comes to civilian courts, at least, all such travesties as these WE THE PEOPLE serving KNOWLEDGEABLY as CITIZEN JURORS can STOP COLD! So long as there is any semblance of Freedom left in America at all - with even one honorable, aware juror sitting on each such case - high-level, traitorous criminals in the government cannot win! We cannot say it too often: That is the awesome power of an American Juror!

ON THE FIELD OF BATTLE

We lawmen and soldiers would urge readers to JOIN THE FIGHT. Get in touch with the defense team of *American Hero, Michael New*. Write or call project manager, Mr. Daniel New, P.O. Box 100, Iredell, Texas 76649 (254) 796-2173. E-mail: ddnew@mikenew.com. Web site: www.mikenew.com or www.unwatch.com.

A special note: In February 2006, Defense Attorney Herb Titus recorded on CD a superb update of the case, as to where it stands in civilian appeals court. This presentation includes a great recap of the most recent, ongoing attempts of judges to continue the sell-out of our soldiers and our nation in this way.

Please lend your support in this most crucial effort to reassert American sovereignty and independence, both militarily and civilly. Brother Michael winning this case would have a definite *killer effect* toward protecting *all* our brother and sister soldiers from ever having to serve as mercenaries for a one-world, Marxist government. And please realize this: If enough of our soldiers would just say NO to serving in the world military - as Michael New did - there could never be an anti-Christ "New World Order"!!! (Remember that saying?....."What if they gave a war and nobody came?!!!" That's precisely

what we're talking about here!)

Citizen Jurors may not be able to do much about treasonous conduct on the part of U.S. military leaders, but they *can* do something when a military case like this shows up in our civilian courts. Again, this case sharply illustrates *why*, when serving as jurors, We the People need to *definitively clip the wings* of all government agent judges bent on facilitating the destruction of American sovereignty and independence, when and as ordered by their international crime lords. So if you want to help STOP TYRANNY, you must GET ON A JURY!

OPERATION BACKFIRE: A BUILDING BLOCK OF FREEDOM RESTORATION

When it comes to capturing the attention and touching the hearts of America's peace officers and soldiers, no one delivers the message quite like retired police officer, Jack McLamb, "hitting home" every time!

Speaking at a recent Texas Truth Seekers conference, Jack gave another of his rousing "wake-up call" messages designed to show all Americans - and particularly his fellow lawmen - just how freedom can be restored *and preserved* in our Land *without bloodshed*. The inspiring 2-hour message gave new hope to all in attendance, and is now available on DVD.

Appealing first of all to sworn lawmen at the county, state and federal levels - as also America's military personnel - Officer Jack explained how, by the careful and *correct* use of their lawful powers, sworn officers can *avoid unwittingly selling out their countrymen*, and at the same time act as a legitimate force to halt the power grab by which an international criminal elite seeks ultimate and total control over the USA.

But his appeal is to private citizens, as well. "If the good American people will join in", Officer Jack says, "helping to alert more and more of our peace officers and soldiers as to *just who* the true enemies of God and Liberty are in our nation - - if we can persuade only a *sizable portion* of our uniformed protectors to turn back and stand on the side of the sovereign People, opposing the despotic shadow government elite, then America once again will know freedom and prosperity."

Everyone is encouraged to obtain copies of this DVD to share as widely and rapidly as possible, keeping in mind that unless the enemies of Liberty are stopped, our rights of free expression and free association that allow us to do so will be gone.

Copies of this DVD are available from Aid & Abet. \$15 for one, \$24 for two. Call for quantity prices.

In a time of universal deceit, telling the truth is a revolutionary act. ~ George Orwell

SUBSCRIPTION and ORDER FORM**Aid & Abet Police & Military Newsletter:** Must Reading for every cop, soldier and civilian!

Subscription (6 periodic issues).....	\$25.00
In Canada and Mexico.....	\$30.00 U.S.
All other foreign countries.....	\$35.00 U.S.
Special: Set of available back issues (minimum of 15).....	\$25.00

Aid & Abet in Quantity (Price per copy, including shipping and handling)

Single copy.....	\$4.00
2 - 6 copies.....	\$2.50
7 - 20 copies.....	\$2.00
21 - 49 copies.....	\$1.50
50 copies or more.....	\$1.00

Operation Vampire Killer 2000 from Police & Military Against the New World Order

Prices are for shipments with the U.S. To obtain prices for outside the U.S., please call (208) 935-7853.

Quantity (Price per copy, including shipping and handling)

1 book.....	\$11.00
2 books.....	\$ 8.00 each
3 - 4 books.....	\$ 6.00 each
5 - 6 books.....	\$ 5.00 each
7 - 9 books.....	\$ 4.50 each
10 - 25 books.....	\$ 4.00 each
26 - 50 books.....	\$ 3.70 each
51 - 200 books.....	\$ 3.30 each
201 - 500 books.....	\$ 3.00 each

Citizens Rule Book (Pocket Constitution) Every true-blue American should have one.**Quantity** (Price per copy, including shipping and handling)

1 booklet.....	\$3.00
2 - 14 booklets.....	\$2.00 each
15 - 30 booklets.....	\$1.50 each
31 - 48 booklets.....	\$1.25 each
49 - 75 booklets.....	\$1.10 each
76 - 100 booklets.....	\$1.00 each
101 or more.....	\$.80 each

Other Great and Vital Books for Study: (Prices include shipping and handling.)

<i>Scofield or the Bible</i> by Paul E. Sisco.....	\$ 7.00
<i>The Bible Distinction Between the House of Israel and the House of Judah</i> by F.F. Bosworth.....	\$ 5.00
<i>A Martyr Speaks: A Journal of the Late John A. Coey</i>	\$10.00
<i>Chaplains & Clergy of the American Revolution</i> by J. T. Headley.....	\$10.00
** The Christian and Civil Government by Pastor John Weaver (newly republished).....	\$15.00
<i>The Sovereignty of God and Civil Government</i> by Pastor John Weaver.....	\$15.00
<i>Five Thousand Year Leap</i> by W. Cleon Skousen.....	\$15.00
<i>Inside the New Age Nightmare</i> by Randall Baer.....	\$10.00
<i>Kinsey Report: Crimes & Consequences</i> by Judith A. Reisman, PhD.....	\$20.00
<i>To Harass Our People</i> by Congressman George Hansen.....	\$ 5.00
<i>The Planned Destruction of America</i> by James W. Wardner.....	\$14.00
<i>The Waco Whitewash</i> by Major Jack DeVault.....	\$18.00
<i>What's Right for All Americans</i> by Ezola Foster.....	\$16.00
<i>VoteScam: The Stealing of America</i> by James and Kenneth Collier.....	\$10.00
<i>Born Again Republic</i> by M.J. "Red" Beckman.....	\$ 7.00
<i>Walls in our Minds</i> by M.J. "Red" Beckman.....	\$ 4.00
<i>The Proper Role of Law Enforcement</i> by "Sheriff" Richard Mack.....	\$ 8.00
<i>Army Spc. Michael New: Mercenary or American Soldier</i> by Daniel D. New.....	\$ 7.00
<i>Michael New: His Refusal to Wear the U.N. Uniform (Full Color Picture Book)</i> by Hal Jones.....	\$8.00

POSTERS (Prices include shipping.)

- * **U.S. Constitution Poster** - 24" X 36, full color. 1 for \$10.00, 2 for \$16.00, 3 or more, \$6.00 each.
- * **Tower of Babel Poster** - Shows NWO is Luciferian plan. 17" X 24", full color. 1 for \$10.00, 2 for \$16.00, 3 or more, \$6.00 each.
- * **Chart of 100+ Globalist/Conspiracy Organizations and Programs** - from 11th Century to present. Hand designed. Approx. 17" X 22", blue on white. 1 for \$10, 2 for \$16, 3 or more, \$6.00 each.
- * **"I'm from the Government, and Here to Help You."** Photo of federal agent by Bob Strong. 17" X 24", black and white. First poster \$5.00. Add \$3.00 for each additional.

T-SHIRTS (from the American Citizens & Lawmen Association) (Prices include shipping.)

- * **ACLA T-shirt**, Top quality - Ash with blue trim. Indicate size, M, L, XL, XXL, \$21.95 each, with \$1.00 added for XX.
- * **U.S. Constitution T-Shirt: "Void where prohibited by law."** Indicate color preference: Ash, Navy, Black, and size: M, L, XL, XXL, \$21.95 each, with \$1.00 added for XX.
- * **"Get US Out!"** (with UN logo) "The pathway to hell is being paved by the UN." Indicate color preference: Ash, Navy, Black, and size: M, L, XL, XXL, \$21.95 each, with \$1.00 added for XX.

***** Prices Subject to Change without Notice *****

1. Fill Out:

Name: _____

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Telephone: (_____) _____ - _____

Agency/Service Branch: _____

Title/Rank/or Private Citizen: _____

Active Duty/Retired: _____

For Subscription: Self Sub. ____ Gift Sub. ____ (If Gift Sub, should we reveal your name? ____ Yes ____ No)

2. Mark off selected items on order sheet, and indicate number of items ordered: _____

3. Total amount of order: \$_____. (CASH or POSTAL money order ONLY, Please!)

* FOREIGN ORDERS other than Canada and Mexico, please add 30% for AIR MAIL shipping. *

** U.S. Funds Only, Please! **

4. Send to:

AID & ABET POLICE & MILITARY NEWSLETTER

HC 11, BOX 357, Kamiah, Idaho 83536

Telephone: (208) 935-7852 Fax: (208) 935-7854